

REMARKS

Claims 33-45 are pending in this application and have been examined. Claim 42 is allowed. Claims 33-41 and 43-45 are rejected. Claims 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43 and 44 are amended herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 38-41 and 43 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the disclosure of the parent application referenced by the declaration does not support the step of rotating such that a bubble agitates the fluid in the container. All of the rejected claims have been amended to eliminate reference to agitation of the fluid by a bubble, thereby overcoming this rejection.

Claims 35, 36, 39, 40, 44 and 45 are rejected as being indefinite because there is lack of antecedent basis for "probe array". All references to "probe array" in the rejected claims have been changed to "polymer array", thereby overcoming this rejection.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 33 and 35-40 are rejected as being anticipated by Wells (U.S. Pat. No. 423,362). Wells is directed to a method for churning milk or cream in multiple simple vessels such as pails, barrels or jars. Vessels containing milk (or cream) are placed in a rotatable frame that secures a lid placed onto one end of the vessel, and the frame is rotated or oscillated to agitate the milk to effect the churning. The Examiner contends that the proteins of milk or cellulose in the wood lid taught by Wells may be considered to be "polymer arrays" within the scope of the claims.

Independent claim 33 has been amended to specify that the polymer array has complementary probe sequences and that the fluid contains at least one target molecule (e.g. as

supported by original claim 41). Wells does not disclose or suggest this limitation. Independent claim 38 has been amended to specify that the fluid reacts with the polymer array. Wells only discloses a physical agitation (churning) of the milk in the vessels. Even if the wood or milk could be considered polymer arrays as the Examiner contends, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Wells that the polymer array (e.g. wood) reacts with the liquid (e.g. milk) as set forth in amended claim 38. For these reasons, withdrawal of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Mart C. Matthews
Reg. No. 26,201

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 303-571-4321
MCM/cl
60635480 v1